RESPONSE AND REMARKS

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13-18 were rejected as being anticipated by Koenck et al. (U.S Patent No. 6,006,100; "*Koenck*") under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

In rejecting Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13-18 under §102(e), the Examiner stated that "[r]eceiving configuration data and exchanging other communication data from a peripheral piece of equipment is how computer systems work and is therefore inherent in the Koenck computer system. See step #8 p. 215 of "How Computers Work" for evidence." Office Action, page 3, paragraph 2.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13-18 as being unpatentable over Koenck et al. under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In rejecting Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13-18 under §103(a), the Examiner stated that "Bowles shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying receiving configuration data and exchanging other communication data from a peripheral piece of equipment (specifically, a digital scale)." Office Action, Page 4, paragraph 3.

The Examiner's reference to *Bowles* is unclear – there is no identification of the *Bowles* reference, other than the name, in either the text of the Office Action, or in the FORM PTO-892 attached to the Office Action.

In rejecting Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13-18 under §103(a), the Examiner stated that "'How Computers Work' teaches, pages 214 and 215, how computer ports communicate with peripheral equipment, including receiving configuration data and exchanging other communication data from a peripheral piece of equipment in order to be able to work together. See step #8 of p. 215 of 'How Computers Work'". Office Action, page 5, paragraph 1. Further, the Examiner

stated that, "[b]ased on the teaching of 'How Computers Work', it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made, to modify the Koenck computer system to further specify how communication works in its computer system in order to better show how the parts of the computer system work together."

REMARKS REGARDING THE SECTION 102(e) AND 103(a) REJECTIONS

The Examiner's rejections under Sections 102(e) and 103(a) have been carefully considered. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 11, and 13-17 have been amended to more distinctly claim the claimed invention. Claims 6, 12, and 18 were previously cancelled.

For the reasons described further below, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose, anticipate, teach or suggest all of the limitations of the Claims as amended.

It is respectfully asserted that the cited references do not disclose, anticipate, teach or suggest all of the limitations of, for example, amended Claim 1, which is directed to a shipping management computer system that is programmed to:

> receive a first digital scale configuration input from a first user, via a first remote user client computer device of a plurality of remote client computer devices, wherein said first digital scale configuration input corresponds to a first digital scale configured with the first remote user client computer device, wherein the first digital scale configuration input comprises at least one item of scale configuration information that is selected from a group consisting of: (A) a make of the first digital scale, (B) a model of the first digital scale, and (C) a type of port through which the first digital scale communicates with the first remote user client computer device, and wherein each remote user client computer device of the plurality of remote user client computer devices accesses the shipping management computer system via a communications network;
> receive an indication from the first user, via the first remote user client computer device, that the first digital scale will be used to measure a first weight of a first parcel;
> send an instruction, according to information about the make and model of the first digital scale, to the first digital scale, via the first remote

user client computer device, to measure the first weight of the first parcel; and

receive, via the first remote user client computer device, the first weight measured by the first digital scale.

It is respectfully asserted, for example, that there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in the cited references of "...receiv[ing] a first digital scale configuration input from a first user ...". Rather, as compared to "...receiv[ing] a first digital scale configuration input from a first user ...", the Examiner stated in the Office Action that "...inherently, in 'an assigned device'[,] the system *has* identification information including make and model because the system needs to know the correct protocols [about] that ... device." Office Action, page 3, paragraph 1 (emphasis added). Further, as compared to "...receiv[ing] a first digital scale configuration input *from a first user* ...", the Examiner stated in the Office Action that "[r]eceiving configuration data and exchanging other communication data *from a peripheral piece of equipment* is how computer systems work and is therefore inherent in the Koenck computer system. See step #8 p. 215 of "How Computers Work" for evidence." Office Action, page 3, paragraph 2.

As compared to the cited references, the Specification of the present application explains that "...the System supports various makes and models of scales. Each scale make and model has a set of features and requirements for which the System must be programmed in order for the System to communicate properly with each particular scale." Specification, page 31, line 27 – page 32, line 1. With respect to an exemplary embodiment, the Specification of the present application further explains that:

[t]he System provides an ActiveX control dedicated to communications with peripheral devices configured with client PCs ("Shipping Station ActiveX Control") 607. Contained within the Shipping Station ActiveX Control is a table (the "scale table") 608 containing entries for each supported scale make and model and provides logic to process the communication information for each scale make and model as appropriate.

Specification, page 32, lines 1-5.

The Specification of the present application yet further explains, with respect to an exemplary embodiment, that:

> ... the System uses the information for the particular scale make and model from the scale table 608 of scale makes and models to send a communication query to the particular scale 616. Typically, the communication query information required by a particular scale make and model is a particular set of characters. Each scale make and model recognizes a unique set of characters as a request for a weight. Accordingly, the appropriate set of characters that means a request for weight to a particular scale make and model is stored in the scale table for a particular scale make and model.

Specification, page 33, lines 1-7. As supported by the above-cited disclosure of the Specification of the present application, amended Claim 1 recites that the claimed shipping management computer system is also programmed to "...send an instruction, according to information about the make and model of the first digital scale, to the first digital scale, via the first remote user client computer device, to measure the first weight of the first parcel ...". It is respectfully asserted that the cited references do not anticipate, disclose, teach or suggest the above-recited limitations of amended Claim 1.

For reasons similar to those described above with respect to amended independent Claim 1, it is respectfully asserted that the cited references do not anticipate, disclose, teach or suggest, e.g., the limitations of amended Claim 7 of "receiving an input from a first user ... wherein said input comprises: (A) a make of a digital scale configured with the first remote user client computer device, (B) a model of the digital scale, and (C) a type of port through which the digital scale communicates with the first remote user client computer device ..." or "... sending a request, via the first remote access system, to the digital scale to measure the weight of the parcel according to information about the make and model of the digital scale ...".

As further distinguished from the cited references, it is respectfully

asserted that there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in the cited references of "...receiv[ing], via a set of browser software executing on a particular remote user client computer device of the plurality of remote user client computer devices, an indication from a particular user associated with the particular remote user client computer device that a digital scale configured with the particular remote user client computer device will be used to measure a weight of a particular parcel, wherein said digital scale is of a particular make and model, and wherein said digital scale is configured with the remote user client computer device via a particular type of port, wherein the set of browser software is adapted to retrieve and render hyper-media content from one or more computers via a global communications network ..." and then "...send[ing], according to information about the particular make and model of the digital scale, via the set of browser software, instructions to the particular remote user client computer device to: (1) receive a weight of a particular parcel as measured by the digital scale; and (2) communicate the weight of the particular parcel to the shipping management computer system ..." as recited by amended independent Claim 13.

As compared to the above-recited limitations of amended Claim 13, the "How Computers Work" reference cited by the Examiner describes how a universal serial bus in a PC works to control communications between the PC and devices peripheral to that PC. It is respectfully submitted, as compared to the above-recited limitations of Claim 13, that there is no disclosure in the cited "How Computers Work" reference regarding ways in which a computer system can obtain information about devices, such as scales, that are peripheral to client computers that are remote to the computer system and where the remote client computers access the computer system via browser software.

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is therefore respectfully submitted that amended independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 of the present application, and

therefore Claims 2-5, 8-11, and 14-17 that are dependent on amended Claims 1, 7 and 13, respectively, are patentable over the cited references and are therefore in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments, and for the foregoing reasons and authorities, it is respectfully asserted that the invention disclosed and claimed in the present application, as amended, is not fairly taught by any of the references of record, taken either alone or in combination, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the application as amended herewith are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, ALC

By _____

Marilyn R. Khorsandi
Reg. No. 45,744
626/796-2856